

9 December 1982

POINTS OF INTEREST FROM NIO/SP TESTIMONY TO SSCI,

8 DECEMBER 1982

- It went real well, no problems.
- The Senators were anxious to try to understand the technical basis for Peacekeeper survivability--the combination of high hardness, to force Soviet yields up, and close spacing, to cause fratricide. I believe I succeeded in explaining this, and the various technical and operational uncertainties, to many of them in a sufficiently non-technical way that they seemed to get the idea. I would recommend that anyone briefing Congressmen make a valiant effort to try to explain it in simple terms--it is possible. I will try to do this in my future testimony, in the context of what problems and uncertainties the Soviets face in having to devise approaches to attacking MX.
- There was great value in my testimony being a coordinated view of CIA, DIA, and Air Force Intelligence. An SSCI staffer noted the importance of this to the Committee. I will use my testimony, nearly verbatim, as the story on MX in NIE 11-3/8-82.
- There was high value in having Dr. Marv Atkins from Dr. DeLauer's staff in attendance. He was able to provide answers to some important questions regarding DoD approaches to missile design and countermeasures to potential Soviet responses.
- I talked with Col. Russell from the NSC Staff this morning. He raised the suggestion that some joint testimony, maybe open, of DoD and the Intelligence Community would be worthwhile. I agreed it probably would be, but such a determination should be made by the DCI. Based on my experience yesterday with having Marv Atkins at my briefing, I endorse the suggestion and believe it is an effective means of helping Congress sort out the issues with regard to the MX program.

CONFIDENTIAL